

FILED

FEB 16 2006

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ANTHONY LOUIS SASSO, aka Anthony
Lewis Sasso,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 04-10371

D.C. No. CR-02-00046-WHA

MEMORANDUM^{*}

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
William H. Alsup, Distict Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 13, 2006^{**}

Before: FERNANDEZ, RYMER, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Anthony Louis Sasso appeals from his 168-month sentence imposed after pleading guilty to manufacturing of marijuana, money laundering, and conspiracy,

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

^{**} This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

all in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1956(a)(1)(A)(I), (h), and 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1) and 846. We dismiss.

A review of the record indicates that Sasso knowingly and voluntarily waived his right to appeal and was sentenced within the terms of the plea agreement. We therefore enforce the waiver and dismiss the appeal. *See United States v. Nguyen*, 235 F.3d 1179, 1182 (9th Cir. 2000) (stating that an appeal waiver is valid when it is entered knowingly and voluntarily); *see also United States v. Cardenas*, 405 F.3d 1046, 1048 (9th Cir. 2005) (noting that the changes in sentencing law imposed by *United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220 (2005), did not render waiver of appeal involuntary and unknowing).

Because Sasso validly waived his right to appeal, we do not reach the merits of his appeal. *See United States v. Vences*, 169 F.3d 611, 613 (9th Cir. 1999).

To the extent that Sasso raises a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel, we decline to address it. *See United States v. McKenna*, 327 F.3d 830, 845 (9th Cir. 2003) (stating that ineffective assistance of counsel claims are generally inappropriate on direct appeal).

DISMISSED.